



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Ever since Georg Curtius popularized the distinction between *Zeitstufe* and *Zeitart*, as he did in his *Schulgrammatik* of fifty years syne, both teachers and makers of school grammars have repeatedly rebelled against the traditional nomenclature. What sense is there in a present imperative when the imperative is future, what sense in a present subjunctive when the subjunctive is a future? Some grammarians, moved by the devil, who is the author of all confusion, have actually used present and past imperfect; Aken, on the other hand, proposed to use Verbum Imperfectum, Aoristum, Perfectum throughout. But if anything is clear, it is clear that it is necessary to keep away from the inevitable associations with the indicative tenses. Now I am not enamored of new terminology and am disposed to leave all these inventions to the gentlemen who are manufacturing spectrum gratings for the Latin subjunctive. But, if we are to have a new set of words for the relations that are common to all the moods, indicative included, it seems to me better that we should take refuge in Greek. 'Durative' is not perfectly satisfactory, as Professor Miller has pointed out in this Journal (XVI 143). 'Complexive' does not exhaust the significance of the aoristic tenses; neither does 'ingressive.' Now the Greek παρατατικός is an infinitely better word than the Latin *imperfectum*, and the only objection to it is the danger of confounding 'paratactic' with 'paratactic.' 'Aoristic' is not very satisfactory. 'Apobatic' is much better; and the use of ἀπέβη in the 'gnomic aorist' seems to encourage the adoption of the word. Cf. Plato, Conv. 181 A: ἐν τῇ πράξει, ὡς ἂν παρχθῇ, τοιοῦτον ἀπέβη. 197 A: οὐ μὲν ἂν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος διδάσκαλος γένηται, ἐλλόγμος καὶ φανὸς ἀπέβη. Hdt. 3, 82: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ φόβου ἀπέβη ἐς μοναρχίην. Finally, the perfect relation might be expressed by 'syntelic' (Gr. συντελικός); and the series would be complete. Present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect and aorist might be left for the indicative. To be sure, I am not all enthusiastic about the suggestion, which may even lack the merit of novelty; for any one who has read long and read widely cannot always put his finger on the source of notions, whether the scratched poll and the gnawed nails or the morass of what is called 'grammatical literature.' But who can tell whether shall prosper, either this or that, in grammatical nomenclature? Who could have dreamed of the rivalry for the credit of 'prospective'?

Among the new books, the number and variety of which bewilder the unfortunate editor of this Journal, I notice an ele-

mentary grammar of the Hebrew tongue by a Dutch scholar, J. D. WIJNKOOP, *Handleiding tot de kennis der hebreeuwſche taal, Tweede Stuk* (Brill, Leiden); and this second Part (*Wortvoeging*) reminds me that AKEN, just mentioned, is one of the few Greek scholars to make use of the Hebrew verb in elucidation of the Greek (*Tempus u. Modus*, § 14). AKEN'S *Tempus u. Modus* was published in 1861, when Americans of my latitude had scant access to any foreign literature, including that of the United States; but even before 1861 I had noticed for myself the importance of that 'höchst alterthümliche und daher syntactisch nicht unwichtige Sprache.' The Hebrew Imperfect, once called the future, is 'paratatic,' the Hebrew Perfect is 'apobatic,' and with these two tenses, the 'Holy Tongue' gets on very comfortably. It is a pity that classical scholars do not take an occasional run outside of their own palings. It would strengthen their muscles indefinitely. So, for instance, the problems of the Greek accusative are child's play by the side of the Hebrew accusative, or better perhaps the so-called accusative. Everything is 'so-called' nowadays. And when I am saddened by the present development of psychological syntax and ask with Professor Hale 'Whether there is still a Latin Potential?' I take down my precious Mpongwe Grammar and comfort me with 'affirmative and negative Potentials,' that flourish or flourished on the banks of the Gaboon River.

Seriously speaking, the chief trouble about 'potential,' as about many terms that are bandied about in the 'ping-pong' sport of recent grammarians, lies in the want of clear definition, of sharp synonymical distinction. 'Potential' is not 'possible' merely, 'potentiality' is not 'possibility' merely. No one who uses modern English carefully ought to confound the two for a moment. When Mr. Tyndall in his famous Belfast address said that he discerned in matter 'the promise and potency of all terrestrial life,' 'promise' explains 'potency.' We are not in the region of foot-pounds. We are in a moral region. The 'potential chick' is something more than 'a possible chick,' and even if those who invented the term 'potential mood' had no such sharp distinction in their minds, it matters not. Both 'possibility' and 'potentiality' lie in the word *posse*, lie in the word *δύνασθαι*. But *δύνασθαι* splits itself into *οἶον εἶναι* and *οἶον τ' εἶναι*: and *ἡ δύναμις* and *τὸ δυνατόν* are not the same. *ἡ δύναμις* belongs to the sphere of potentiality (*φύσις*); *τὸ δυνατόν* to the sphere of 'possibility' (*τύχη*), (A. J. P. XIX 231), just as *οἶος* is used of character in the Characters of Theophrastus, while *οἶός τε* is used of 'position,' merely. (A. J. P. VII 165.) These distinctions were present to the minds of the Greeks, and are therefore worth much more than modern analyses, which can go on refining and

refining without aiding the student in the least to get the antique point of view—the all-important thing to him who wishes to master the secrets of antique expression. But I have hammered at this before (A. J. P. XIX 231).

Professor BRUGMANN is doing a memorable service to the cause of comparative grammar in bringing out an abridged edition of his great work, under the title *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Strassburg, K. J. Trübner), the first part of which is to be followed speedily by the others, so that the whole work will be in the hands of the student in the early part of 1903. To the ethnic grammarian the half is more than the whole, and many a classical philologist will be won by this concession to the needs of a busy guild: although I imagine that classical philologists are not generally such strangers to the processes of scientific linguistics as Professor BRUGMANN seems to think. WHITNEY and PAUL, whom he commends to our attention, are familiar to us all, and OERTEL's new book, *Study of Language*, will occupy a shelf of easy access, even to us. All philological thinking, all philological teaching, is profoundly influenced by the methods of comparative grammar: and the μένος' ἀπιστεῖν that prevents the incorporation of every new theory into the body of grammatical doctrine is not to be mistaken for ignorance. If, for instance, I were writing on the genitive for students of Greek syntax, I should not proceed to reverse the old tenet, which represents the genitive as dependent on the verbal element of the noun rather than on the nominal element of the verb. Why not? First, because I think it can be shown that this was the Greek conception, not necessarily the original conception, but the popular conception; and for me the Greek conception is decisive; decisive for the line of development, decisive for artistic expression. And then if we go back to the original conception the noun has all the rights of the verb. The noun is a verb at rest. The verb is a noun in motion. Quicken the noun, you have a verb. Freeze a verb, you have a noun. The question of priority is naught. When Noun and Verb, which we are as apt to personify as was the author of the *Bellum grammaticale*—when Noun and Verb were born into the world, there was no midwife to tie a scarlet thread on the hand of the twin that came out first. (Gen. xxxviii: 28.) And I note with great interest that while Brugmann in his Gr. Gr.,³ p. 392, accepts Delbrück's position, he adds a caution against the sharp distinction between the adnominal and the adverbial genitive and urges with a great deal of force the bias of the Teutonic mind, due to the use of the German genitive, and emphasizes the importance of considering also the *von* periphrasis of the genitive. In English our genitive

has shrunk into a possessive, except in an occasional adverbial phrase; and though the genitive and the *of* periphrases are not absolutely interchangeable and though there is, I believe, an extensive literature on the difference between an 'ass's head' and 'the head of an ass,' still the *of* side, the ablative side, the 'adverbial' side, is not clearly felt. In short, our mixed case presents to our consciousness a fusion that is not un instructive. Think of such an expression as 'admitted *of* the Order of St. Patrick.' As *of* therefore does not carry with it the full ablative signification, so the ablative genitive in Greek calls for prepositional reinforcement; and the whence-case uses of the genitive so often cited from Sophokles are artificial, are hyper-epic and recur again only in Greek that has no contact with the real life of the people.

As a matter of fact, the theory of the cases is the opprobrium of syntax to this day and it will continue to be so. Of the twins, if I dare keep up the figure, the Verb is Valentine and the Noun is Orson. The verb—I speak of the Greek verb—is to a certain extent calculable and we can talk of categories, whereas the case constructions are not to be counted on. And while we must not despair, must not do as Hübschmann has done and content ourselves with giving a list of the verbs that take the accusative, still the cases keep us guessing; and the mixed case business, which was not new in the time of Quintilian, will continue to plague the student of language for aeons of Delbrücks to come.

In an ungracious review of GOODWIN'S *Demosthenes de Corona*, published in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for Jan. 25, 1902, Herr ENGELBERT DRERUP says that it is inexcusable in GOODWIN not to have made use of the reviewer's *Antike Demosthenesausgaben*, which came out as early as 1899. GOODWIN'S preface is dated Nov. 15, 1900, and the complete MS had doubtless been in the hands of the printer months and months before, so that he could not well have availed himself of Herr DRERUP'S illuminating performance. But Professor GOODWIN can take care of himself and an explanation will doubtless be forthcoming in due time. One thing, however, I will mention by way of illustrating the spirit of so much German criticism of American work. In order to punish Professor GOODWIN for his sin of omission Herr ENGELBERT DRERUP has characterized the veteran scholar as one 'der in seiner Heimath als griechischer Grammatiker bekannt ist.' This is assuredly faint praise of a man whose syntactical work is regarded in England with a reverence that is dangerously near to superstition (A. J. P. XII 388; XIV 126; XVII 516), and whose name had been familiar

to German scholars long before Herr ENGELBERT DRERUP was 'dry behind the ears.' If GOODWIN is to blame for not knowing DRERUP'S work, which, I grant, has attracted much attention, what is one to say of DRERUP, who ought to be familiar with REHDANTZ'S *Indices*, in the third ed. of which (1874) GOODWIN is repeatedly cited? But in view of the fact that we Americans have done so much work in the grammatical line, DRERUP'S sneer may in the course of time come to be a high compliment.

The Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (N. Y., Henry Frowde), the first numbers of which were welcomed by the Journal, is speeding on its way. The latest issues at the time of writing (April, 1902) are MONRO and ALLEN'S *Iliad* and BURNET'S *Republic of Plato*. Those who have to teach and study Plato in his entirety are especially to be congratulated on the prospect of having so good a text as BURNET'S complete within a reasonable time. A word of warning, however, to the intending purchaser. The recent numbers have come to the Journal in paper covers and it is but right to say that the books fall to pieces with the fatal facility of the German editions; and the trifling additional expense of a sixpence or at most a shilling for bound copies ought to be cheerfully borne by those who use the books. There is also an edition of the Republic on India paper at 7s. (\$1.75) and another on 4to paper for marginal notes at 10s. 6d. (\$2.60).

In Professor GILBERT MURRAY'S text edition of *Euripides* which belongs to the same Oxford series, I am sorry to see that the editor with the same lightheartedness that characterizes his History of Greek Literature has followed what he takes to be the chronological order of the plays. Only special students will read Euripides in that way; and for ready reference the alphabetical order of which NAUCK has set the example is much better.

The *Archiv für Stenographie* (Berlin, Thormann u. Goetsch) gives up a large part of its space to the subject of ancient tachygraphy, and deserves to be better known by students of palaeography. The last number that has reached the Journal has an interesting article by the well-known palaeographer WESSELY and a review of Foat's article in the Hellenic Studies by the Viennese scholar GITLBAUER. This is a field of research that ought to be especially congenial to Americans.

My acquaintance with Goethe goes back to the beginning of my Teutonomanic period in 1847, and I doubt whether any

boy of my age ever devoured so much of Goethe in so short a time. There was not much that I left unread from Goetz von Berlichingen to the Second Part of Faust. His lyrics were my delight and I learned many of his 'Sprüche' by heart. But while I enjoyed the light and the warmth of my luminary, I did not inquire too curiously in what sign of the zodiac my sun was standing, or whose star, not to say petticoat, was in the ascendant, Friederike's, Frau von Stein's, or Ulrike von Levetzow's. Since that far-off time every recess of Goethe's life has been explored and every sinuosity of his long career has been lighted up, and in his edition of *Goethe's Poems* (Holt) Professor GOEBEL assumes, and assumes justly, a knowledge of Goethe's biography as a prerequisite for the study of the specimens he has selected. Many of my old favorites are there and as I re-read them under Professor GOEBEL's sympathetic guidance I feel how much I lost for the appreciation of the great master himself in the days when I appropriated all that my eager boyish intellect could take in. Whether the ethical influence would have been as potent, if I had known as much of Goethe's moods as I could have learned from such a book as Professor GOEBEL's, is another matter. I do not know; and if I am to follow Goethe still, I ought not to care.

Willst du dir ein hübsch Leben zimmern,
Musst ums Vergangene dich nicht bekümmern.

Under the title of the *Ancient East* Mr. David Nutt (London) has been publishing a series of small books on great subjects by eminent authors. By their popular character these 'shilling shockers', as they may well be called by the ultra-orthodox, withdraw themselves from the critical appreciation of a journal like this. The latest number (IV) is JEREMIAS, *The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell*, which has had as its predecessors WIEDEMANN'S *Realms of the Egyptian Dead*, NIEBUHR'S *Tell El Amarna Period* and ZIMMERN'S *Realms of the Egyptian Dead*.

The great theme that was attacked with airy donnishness by Mr. VERRALL in his *Euripides the Rationalist*, by M. DECHARME with French elegance in his *Euripides et l'esprit de son théâtre*, has been handled with German thoroughness by WILHELM NESTLE in his *Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer). Of the insight shown in the 368 pages of text, of the learning exhibited in the nearly 200 pages of 'Anmerkungen', the limits of *Brief Mention* forbid me to write. And as for a longer review, reams of my performances in that line already await the dust-bin. At the same time I must say frankly that the vast bulk of modern 'appreciations' sometimes make me

sigh for earlier and shorter methods, and that as I contemplate Herr JOËL's well nigh 2000 pages of lucubrations on *Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates*, I wonder whether there will ever be another Quintilian to write an encyclopaedia of Greek and Roman literature in one chapter, and that when I turn over the pages of NESTLE, my thoughts revert to Nauck's admirable introduction to his Euripides. Give that to your class in Euripides with the proof texts. Macerate it, if you choose, for the feebler digestions, but the root of the matter is there.

To pronounce on the merits of a dictionary without actual trial is a *lèse-critique*; and I have refrained for many months from saying anything in commendation of HARDER's *Schulwörterbuch zur Homers Iliad und Odyssee* (Leipzig, Freytag), despite the seductions of large, fair type, up-to-date illustrations, and very reasonable price. Lately, however, I took the book with me on a voyage through Iliad and Odyssey, and found that it answered admirably to repeated tests. La Roche, a high authority, has in a recent review (*Z. ö. G.* 1902, p. 36) made himself responsible for the completeness of the book and, when one recalls the absurd omissions of so many pretentious lexicographical works, that is a great point gained. Of course, in an Homeric dictionary intended for schools a certain dogmatism is necessary. So αἰγίλιψ which in the larger lexica is the haunt of etymological storms, appears in AUTENRIETH, as I ought to have mentioned in my discussion of the word (*A. J. P.* XVI 261) and in HARDER, with the interpretation, which I advocated there and no variant is given. But it is the business of the teacher or the commentary to supplement the school dictionary, and, fortunately or unfortunately, almost all the disputed Homeric words are still as doubtful as they were in the days when Chapman, our 'English Lucan', gave his translation to the world. It comforts one to think that Pindar did not have any clear notion of what ἡλίβατος meant (*O.* 6, 4) and that he could not have stood a better examination in ἀμαιμάκετος than did the fellow in the Δαιταλῆς οὐκ ἀμειννὰ κάρηνα. But remarks like this will be set down to the 'miching mallecho' of the inditer of *Brief Mention*.

C. J.: MACLEAN's *Dictionary of Vernacular Syriac as spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, &c.* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press), is intended as a companion volume to the author's *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac* (Cambridge, 1895), which treats of the language spoken by the Eastern Syrian Christians, also called Nestorians or Chaldeans, dwelling upon the borders of Turkey and Persia. A large part of the

material was gathered by the author during his five years' residence in the country as head of the Archbishop of Canterbury's mission, a position which gave him exceptional opportunities. He also had the assistance of several manuscript vocabularies, and has drawn to some extent from the works of Sachau, Socin, Lidzbarski and others, but practically all the material, from whatever source derived, has been carefully revised in the light of his own personal observation. A most useful feature of the work lies in the fact that the pronunciation of each word is given in Roman letters in accordance with a clear and simple system of transliteration. The introduction contains a classification of the various dialects spoken by the Eastern Syrians, with brief notes as to their chief peculiarities and some general remarks upon their pronunciation. The typography of the book leaves nothing to be desired.

E. G. S.: H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT's recent edition of *Cicero's First Philippic* (Paris, Klincksieck) is voluminous and industrious; it is the first, by the by, since Lemaire's general edition of 1830. Latin courses in France, we believe, are largely ordained by central authorities. There is a preponderance of verbal exegesis which seems to run largely towards etymologizing notes. To DE MIRMONT Cicero is the illustrious figure of Roman oratory and republican consistency; and his views are not deflected by the labored vituperation of Drumann, or by the Caesar worship of Mommsen. There are one or two references to Plutarch, while Appian and Dio, repositories in great measure of Asinius Pollio and of Livy, are left unmentioned. Nor do we see any acknowledgment of the obligations under which Merguet has placed all students of Cicero. Causeret's study of Cicero's technology and criticism of literature (1886) is accurate and painstaking, and while not adding anything to Ernesti and Volkmann, would seem to show that this aspect of the study of Cicero is not neglected in France. DE MIRMONT pays no attention to such technical analysis, which, however, is a postulate for closer approach to the art of Cicero, so eminently a conscious master of τέχνη.